

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-4, 6, 8-11, 13, 14, 18-26, and 32-33 are presently active in this case. Claims 1, 6, 8, 10, 11, 14, 18, 20, and 22 have been presently amended to include allowable subject matter. Claims 5, 7, 12, 15, 16, 17, 27-31, and 34-35 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1-4, 13, 27-28, 30-31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bethune et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,188,768) in view of Lauzon (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0165808), Claims 5, 7, 14-16, 19, 21, 23-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bethune et al in view of Lauzon and further in view of Blow (U.S. Patent No. 5,757,912), Claims 6 and 8-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bethune et al in view of Lauzon and further in view of Blow and further in view of Moeller et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,538,787), Claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bethune et al in view of Lauzon and further in view of Blow and further in view of Reingand et al (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0058499), Claim 29 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bethune et al in view of Lauzon and further in view of Szafraniec (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0122180), Claims 32-35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bethune et al in view of Lauzon and further in view of Blow and further in view of Foden et al (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0097874). Claims 12, 17, 18, 20, and 22 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Applicants acknowledge with appreciation the indication that Claims 12, 17, 18, 20, and 22 include allowable subject matter. In order to expedite allowance, the subject matter of Claims 5, 7, and 12 have been included in Claim 1. Applicants believe that the former dependence of Claim 12 directly to 11 was not correct, and that the incorporation of the subject matter of Claims 5, 7, and 12 is proper and introduces the allowable subject matter of Claim 12 into Claim 1. Independent Claim 14 has been amended to include the subject matter of Claims 15, 16, and 17. Accordingly, Claims 5, 7, and 12, and Claims 15, 16, and 17 along with Claims 27-31 and 34-35 have been canceled, leaving only claims with allowable subject matter. Claims 18, 20, and 22 have been rewritten in independent form to include the subject matter of their respective base and intervening claims.

Accordingly, independent Claims 1, 14, 18, 20, and 22 (and the claims dependent therefrom) are believed to be in condition for allowance.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment and in light of the above comments, no further issues are believed to be outstanding, and the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



---

Eckhard H. Kuesters  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 28,870

Ronald A. Rudder, Ph.D.  
Registration No. 45,618

Customer Number  
**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 06/04)  
Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 08/03)  
GJM:RAR:clh